

# Whisper Creek Subdivision

## Draft Environmental Impact Report

---

Prepared for:



County of Placer Planning Department

SCH# 2004062132

September 2006

Submitted by:



FOOTHILL ASSOCIATES

© 2006

# Whisper Creek Subdivision

## Draft Environmental Impact Report

Lead Agency:



County of Placer Planning Department  
3091 County Center Drive  
Auburn, CA 95603  
(530) 745-3000

Prepared by:  
Foothill Associates  
655 Menlo Drive, Suite 100  
Rocklin, CA 95765

September 2006

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

## Introduction

This Executive Summary is provided in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines §15123. The CEQA Guidelines state that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will contain a brief summary of the proposed project, identify each significant effect with mitigation that would reduce or avoid that effect, identify areas of known controversy and issues raised by agencies and the public, and identify issues to be resolved.

This summary includes a brief project overview, identifies alternatives considered, identifies issues of concern, and provides a summary table of environmental impacts and mitigation measures that reduce those impacts.

## Project Overview

Towne Development of Sacramento, Inc. (project applicant) proposes the development of 104 single-family residential lots, eight open space lots, one recreation lot, three landscape lots and a private street lot on the ±60.6 acre Whisper Creek Subdivision within the Dry Creek-West Placer Community Plan area of western Placer County, just north of the Sacramento/Placer county line. The project site is comprised of Assessor's Parcel Nos. 023-260-002, 006, 007, and 017. The project would require approval of a rezone, a conditional use permit and a tentative subdivision map.

The 104 residential lots range in size from 10,835 to 27,297 square feet. The average lot size is 13,841 square feet. Eight open space lots and one open space/recreation lot total 17.68 acres. The open space lots correspond to site locations designated as within the 100-year floodplain and/or containing existing drainages and wetlands. The project proposes a buffer area around these locations that excludes the building of residences and is consistent with the Dry Creek-West Placer Community Plan goals and policies.

The project site would be served by a private internal road system that provides access to the existing Placer County road network. The internal circulation system would also provide sidewalks for access and circulation for pedestrians. Internal streets are proposed to have a typical 42-foot wide section which will include two 14-foot wide driving lanes, a 3-foot wide concrete curb and gutter on each side of the street, a 4 to 5 foot planter strip on each side of the street to include two trees for each home, and a 4-foot concrete sidewalk on one side. An internal bicycle path is proposed along the open space lots. This path is depicted on the tentative map as 8 feet to 12 feet wide and meets the County standard of 8' minimum width. Street lighting would be provided that is consistent with Placer County requirements, the Dry Creek-West Placer Community Plan goals and policies, and the Planned Residential Development Design Standards. The subdivision would be accessed by two entrances from PFE Road with one access directly across from Pinehurst Drive in the Morgan Creek development and one access across from Duffy Lane.

Improvements to PFE Road fronting the project site would be included in the project, including right-of-way for Class II Bicycle lanes, landscaping and an eight foot wide meandering pedestrian walkway/Class I bicycle trail. Also, an earthen berm with landscaping screening is proposed to serve as a traffic noise attenuation feature. This berm is proposed to be eight feet high from the pad level of the proposed homes and have a maximum slope of 3:1. A vine covered six foot high wrought iron fence will be located at the top of this slope.

In addition to the applicant's proposed subdivision, Placer County is proposing an amendment to the Dry Creek-West Placer Community Plan that would eliminate the Irrevocable Offer of Dedication (I.O.D.) that currently exists through the project site for the future extension of Don Julio Boulevard from the Sacramento County line to PFE Road. Don Julio Boulevard is currently included in the Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan. This amendment would result in Don Julio Boulevard terminating at the Sacramento County line as it currently does and removes the extension from the future planned circulation system of Placer County. The proposed roadway is not necessary to serve the Whisper Creek Subdivision.

The objectives of the proposed project include the following:

Subdivision components:

- Increase housing supply in Western Placer County.
- Design a residential development that is consistent with the land use designations of the Placer County General Plan and Dry Creek-West Placer Community Plan.
- Construct infrastructure improvements including roadway, sewer service, and water service necessary to support development of the project.

Community Plan amendment component:

- Reduce the amount of future traffic increases from the Antelope area that uses PFE Road between Cook Riolo Road and Walerga Road and move through traffic to regional through routes such as Walerga Road and Antelope North Road.

## **Alternatives**

Alternatives to the project include an evaluation of a no project alternative, a subdivision retaining the easement for the extension of Don Julio Boulevard alternative, and a base zoning alternative. The complete discussion of alternatives and their associated impacts is contained in Chapter 6.0 Alternatives.

## **Issues of Concern**

CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR discuss areas of controversy and issues raised by agencies and the public. An Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Whisper Creek EIR was circulated for public review in June 2004 and the public review period ended July 2004. A Revised Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Whisper Creek EIR was circulated for public review in February 2005 and the public review period ended on March 7, 2005. This EIR addresses issues identified in the project's Initial Study and raised by agency and public comments to the NOP. Issues of controversy and concern that are addressed in specific EIR chapters include:

- Land Use, including the relationship of the proposed project to adjoining parcels;
- Aesthetics, including the project's impact to visual resources and the project's creation of additional light and glare;
- Transportation and Traffic, including trip generation and trip distribution;
- Air Quality, including the project's emissions from construction and buildout;
- Noise, including the project's contribution to traffic noise in the area;
- Biological Resources, including potential impacts to special status species;
- Cultural Resources, including existence of sub-surface archeological resources;
- Public Services and Utilities, including wastewater treatment, water service, and impacts to parks and libraries;
- Hydrology and Water Quality, including potential impacts to Dry Creek, and
- Cumulative impacts from build out of the project, including traffic, aesthetics, and air quality.

### **Environmental Impact and Mitigation Measures**

This Draft EIR uses the following terminology to denote the environmental effects of the proposed project:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** An impact which does not result in a substantial and adverse change in the physical environment. This impact does not require the implementation of mitigation measures.

**Potentially Significant Impact:** An impact that may have a "substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382). The existence of a potentially significant impact requires mitigation to be proposed that would reduce the magnitude of the potential impact.

**Significant Impact:** Substantial and adverse environmental change is likely to occur. A significant impact requires mitigation to reduce the magnitude of the impact.

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact:** Substantial and adverse environmental change is likely to occur. While mitigation may reduce the magnitude of the impact, there is no feasible mitigation that would mitigate the impact to less than significant.

This Draft EIR examines the impacts and potentially significant environmental effects that may result from the implementation of the proposed project. Table ES – 1 summarizes the proposed project's environmental impacts, the level of significance of identified impacts, any associated mitigation measures, and the resulting level of significance after mitigation. After mitigation, all environmental impacts have been reduced to a less than significant level. Chapters 3.0, Environmental Analysis (Sections 3.1 through 3.13) and Chapter 4.0, Cumulative Impacts, provide a detailed analysis of these impacts.

**Table ES – 1 — Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Topic/Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Significance</b>
<b><i>Land Use</i></b>				
Impact 3.1-1	Change in type and intensity of development on the site.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.1-2	The project could result in higher density residential development than the adjoining lots on the project's eastern, western, and northern boundary.	Potentially Significant	3.1-2	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.1-3	Consistency with Land Use policy.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
<b><i>Population and Housing</i></b>				
Impact 3.2-1	Impact to employment opportunities.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.2-2	Increase in the population of unincorporated Placer County.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.2-3	Impacts to housing.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
<b><i>Aesthetics</i></b>				
Impact 3.3-1	The project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and the surroundings.	Significant	3.3-1	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.3-2	The project would create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Significant	3.3-2	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
<b><i>Transportation/Traffic</i></b>				
Impact 3.4-1	Implementation of the proposed project would generate construction-related travel.	Potentially Significant	3.4-1	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.4-2	Implementation of the proposed project would generate vehicle trips related to residents under near-term Existing background conditions.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.4-3	Implementation of the Whisper Creek Subdivision project would generate vehicle trips related to residents under long-term Future (Year 2025) background conditions with PFE Road Closed and Don Julio Boulevard not extended.	Significant	3.4-3	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.4-4	Implementation of the proposed project could generate demand for transit.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.4-5	Implementation of the proposed project could generate demand for bicycle facilities.	Less than Significant	None Required	--

Topic/Impact Number	Impact Description	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
<b>Air Quality</b>				
Impact 3.5-1	Construction-related emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM10 may exceed significance thresholds on a temporary basis during construction.	Significant	3.5-1	After mitigation, impacts would be considered <b>Significant and Unavoidable</b>
Impact 3.5-2	After construction operational emissions of criteria pollutants will contribute to long-term emissions in the region.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
<b>Noise</b>				
Impact 3.6-1	Construction-related noise.	Potentially Significant	3.6-1a, 3.6-1b, and 3.6-1c	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.6-2	Project Generated Traffic Noise.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.6-3	Traffic Noise Impacts on Project Residents.	Potentially Significant	3.6-3a, 3.6-3b, and 3.6-3c	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
<b>Biological Resources</b>				
Impact 3.7-1	The project will have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, by the CDFG or the USFWS; or birds protected by the MBTA.	Significant	3.7-1a, 3.7-1b, 3.7-1c, 3.7-1d, and 3.7-1e	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.7-2	The project may have a substantial adverse effect on oak trees, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.	Potentially Significant	3.7-2a, 3.7-2b, and 3.7-2c	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.7-3	The project will have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (seasonal wetlands, seasonal wetland swales, seasonal marsh, and ephemeral and intermittent drainages) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means.	Significant	3.7-3a, 3.7-3b, and 3.7-3c	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.7-4	The proposed project would interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede use of wildlife nursery sites.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.7-5	The proposed project will conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	Significant	3.7-5	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.7-6	The proposed project will conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	Less than Significant	None Required	--

<b>Topic/Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Significance</b>
<b><i>Cultural Resources</i></b>				
Impact 3.8-1	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.	Potentially Significant	3.8-1	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.8-2	Cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.	Potentially Significant	3.8-2	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.8-3	Damage to inadvertently exposed paleontological resources during construction.	Potentially Significant	3.8-3	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
<b><i>Geology, Soils and Mineral Resources</i></b>				
Impact 3.9-1	Exposure to substantial geologic hazards.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.9-2	Topographic alteration resulting from earth grading.	Potentially Significant	3.9-2a, 3.9-2b, 3.9-2c, 3.9-2d, 3.9-2e, 3.9-2f, and 3.9-2g	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.9-3	Potential for increased erosion during and after construction.	Potentially Significant	3.9-3a, 3.9-3b, 3.9-3c, 3.9-3d, 3.9-3e, 3.9-3f, 3.9-3g, 3.9-3h, 3.9-3i, and 3.9-3j	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.9-4	Seismic Impacts.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.9-5	Mineral resources rendered inaccessible.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
<b><i>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</i></b>				
Impact 3.10-1	Potential contact with stored hazardous waste/materials during construction.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.10-2	Potential contact with contaminated soils or ground water during and after construction.	Potentially Significant	3.10-2	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.10-3	Storage and accidental release of hazardous substances during construction.	Potentially Significant	3.10-3a and 3.10-3b	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.10-4	Accidental release of hazardous substances after construction.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
<b><i>Hydrology/Water Quality</i></b>				
Impact 3.11-1	Increased Runoff Leading to Localized or Downstream Flooding.	Potentially	3.11-1a, 3.11-1b,	After mitigation,



Topic/Impact Number	Impact Description	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
		Significant	3.11-1c, 3.11-1d, and 3.11-1e,	impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.11-2	Ongoing Storm Water Runoff Impacts on Water Quality.	Potentially Significant	3.11-2a, 3.11-2b, 3.11-2c, and 3.11-2d	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
<b>Public Services and Utilities</b>				
Impact 3.12-1	Increased demand for treated surface water.	Potentially Significant	3.12-1	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.12-2	Increased demand for sewage conveyance to wastewater treatment plant.	Potentially Significant	3.12-2	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.12-3	Increased demand on wastewater treatment system.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.12-4	Increased demand on electric supply.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.12-5	Increased demand on the electrical distribution network.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.12-6	Increased demand on natural gas supply.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.12-7	Increased demand on the natural gas distribution system.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.12-8	Increased demand on public services.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.12-9	Increased demand for public schools.	Potentially Significant	3.12-9	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.12-10	Increased demand for public libraries.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.12-11	Increased demand for fire protection service.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.12-12	Increased demand for law enforcement service.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.12-13	Increased demand for vector control.	Potentially Significant	3.12-13	After mitigation, impacts would be less than significant
Impact 3.12-14	Increased demand for telephone and cable services.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.12-15	Increased demand for solid waste hauling.	Less than	None Required	--

Topic/Impact Number	Impact Description	Significance	Mitigation Measure	Residual Significance
		Significant		
Impact 3.12-16	Increased demand for solid waste disposal.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
<b>Recreation</b>				
Impact 3.13-1	The project would create an increased demand for local parks and recreational facilities.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
Impact 3.13-2	The project, in association with other planned development in the area, would create an increased demand for park facilities.	Less than Significant	None Required	--
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>				
Cumulative Land Use	None identified.	No Impact	None Required	--
Cumulative Population and Housing	None identified.	No Impact	None Required	--
Cumulative Aesthetics	Continued development in western Placer and northern Sacramento counties will lead to an increase of light and glare. Although project-specific impacts will be mitigated through lighting design mitigation measures, the continued addition of more forms of night lighting will lead to the spread and intensification of the already present “sky glow” that blocks out views of the night sky.	Regionally, this is considered a significant and unmitigable cumulative impact. However, the project’s contribution to the impact is not considered cumulatively significant.	None Required	--
Cumulative Air Quality	Long-term air quality impacts are associated with the operational characteristics of the project after build out. Although the expected project emissions from these sources are below the PCAPCD’s thresholds, the emissions when considered with emissions from other current and expected projects in the area result in a cumulatively considerable impact.	Potentially Significant	4.3-1	After mitigation, impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable and less than significant
Cumulative Transportation/Traffic	The project’s incremental increase in traffic could potentially result in impacts to the Dry Creek/West Placer Community area traffic, contributing to the need for Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) projects as identified in the Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan. Because the project’s cumulative impacts to traffic are consistent with the Community Plan assumptions, impacts have been addressed by, and would be partially mitigated by the payment of traffic impact fees as specified in the Placer County Code.	Potentially Significant	4.3-2	After mitigation, impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable and less than significant
Cumulative Noise	None identified.	No Impact	None Required	--
Cumulative Biological Resources	None identified.	No Impact	None Required	--

<b>Topic/Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Residual Significance</b>
Cumulative Cultural Resources	None identified.	No Impact	None Required	--
Cumulative Geology, Soils, and Minerals	None identified.	No Impact	None Required	--
Cumulative Hazards & Hazardous Materials	None identified.	No Impact	None Required	--
Cumulative Hydrology/ Water Quality	None identified.	No Impact	None Required	--
Cumulative Public Services and Utilities	None identified.	No Impact	None Required	--
Cumulative Recreation	None identified	No Impact	None Required	--